REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-9, 13-16, 23-28 and 35-42 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 17-20, 29-31, 33 and 43-46 were previously presented or previously amended. Claims 2-4, 10-12, 22, 32 and 34 remain in the application without being amended. Claim 21 is currently amended. No new claim is added.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has considered Applicants' arguments filed December 16, 2003 with respect to prior art rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 and found them persuasive. Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has hence withdrawn her rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

1. Allowable subject matter

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-4, 10-12, 17-20, 33, 34 and 43-46 would be allowable over the prior art of record if the double patenting rejections set forth in the outstanding Office action were overcome.

2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 21, 22 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Regarding claim 21, the Examiner asserts that the limitation "the article" in line 6 lacks sufficient antecedent basis. The Examiner suggests changing "the article" to --lens array-- in line 6 of claim 21 to overcome this rejection.

Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestion and amended claim 21 accordingly. Thus this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is obviated.

3. Double patenting rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 10-12, 17-22, 29-34 and 43-46 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of copending applications 10/255,777, 10/232,193, 10/118,780, 10/035,564, 10/255,926, 10/035,659 and 10/255,730.

Since the claims in all these applications are not in a finalized form, and they may be amended in view of future Office actions, it is premature for Applicants to address these issues at this time. These double patenting rejections may be obviated by amendments and/or arguments already filed or to be filed in these applications. Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to issue this application first, when it is in condition for allowance, and the issue will then be addressed by Applicants in the remaining pending applications.

6. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record considered by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request a prompt Notice of Allowance for the subject application.

Applicants believe that no extension of time is required to make this Amendment timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Amendment timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

The undersigned attorney is granted limited recognition by the Office of Discipline and Enrollment of the USPTO to practice before the USPTO in capacity as an employee of Corning Incorporated. A copy of the document granting such limited recognition either has been previously submitted or is submitted herewith for the record.

Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned at (607) 248-1253.

Respectfully submitted,

CORNING INCORPORATED

Date: April 22, 2004

Siwen Chen
Limited Recognition
Corning Incorporated
Patent Department
Mail Stop SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831